

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,951	11/19/2003	Dave Van Vliet	60538/2:1	9021
52169	7590 08/23/200	5	EXAMINER	
	L INTELLECTUAL FIELD AVENUE	PRINCE, FRED G		
	ON M3H-3S9	·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CANADA			1724	
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,951	VAN VLIET ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred Prince	1724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replace of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH. te. cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communi DONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	ication.
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28.	July 2005.		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matters		its is
Disposition of Claims			
4)	awn from consideration.		. •
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	cepted or b) objected to by edrawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached C	ffice Action or form PTO-15	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage	9
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/N	Imary (PTO-413) fail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11, 04, 07, 12, 06</u>. 	6) Other:	mal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/717,951

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and the species of Group IV in the reply filed on July 28, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claimed method is used within the claimed system. This is persuasive. Accordingly, claims 34 and 35, while withdrawn, will be examined on the merits by the examiner. The requirement is between groups I and III is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the water component" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 2

Art Unit: 1724

5. Claims 1, 4, 24, 31, and 45-47are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robert (EP 0748984).

Robert teaches operating an oxyhydrogen gas generator (1) within a waste treatment system (Figs. 1-2) to produce oxyhydrogen-rich gas (col. 4, lines 1-2); contacting at least a portion of the waste stream with at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas to conduct a unit process for treating the waste stream (30); and conveying at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas for a second use in the waste treatment system including a combustion unit (32; col. 4, lines 5-7), wherein the oxyhydrogen rich gas may be produced from an external water source (col. 5, lines 1-2) and wherein the oxyhydrogen rich gas may be the sole source of energy (col. 3, lines 44-48).

6. Claims 1-2, 24-28, 31, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wesley (US Pat No 3,829,368).

Wesley teaches operating an oxyhydrogen gas generator (20) within a waste treatment system (col. 5, lines 66-73) to produce oxyhydrogen-rich gas (Figure); contacting at least a portion of the waste stream containing a water component with at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas to conduct a unit process for treating the waste stream (col. 6, lines 37-54; col. 7, lines 42-47) and conveying at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas for a second use in the waste treatment system including a fuel cell comprising a combustor (60), wherein the heat given may be recovered and used in the system (col. 7, lines 48-65), the exhaust contains water which is condensed (col. 4, lines 28-32), and wherein the oxyhydrogen rich gas may be the sole source of

Application/Control Number: 10/717,951 Page 4

Art Unit: 1724

energy in a form including power generation (col. 2, lines 66-72; col. 3, lines 1-5), separating the oxyhydrogen gas (40, 50, 52).

7. Claims 1-2, 29, 30, 34-35, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mehl.

Mehl teaches operating an oxyhydrogen gas generator (10, 16) within a waste treatment system (col. 2, lines 68-72; Fig. 1) to produce oxyhydrogen-rich gas (col. 4, lines 70-73); contacting at least a portion of the waste stream containing a water component with at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas to conduct a unit process for treating the waste stream including adhering bubbles to solids (col. 5, lines 61-72) and conveying at least a portion of the oxyhydrogen-rich gas for a second use in the waste treatment system in the form of an ozonization (44), wherein the waste is inherently "stabilized" due to the production of excess ozone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 3 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Wesley or Mehl.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,951

Art Unit: 1724

Wesley and Mehl are described above. Neither reference disclose segregating a portion of a portion of the water to generate oxyhydrogen or using a pulsed electrical signal.

Per claim 3, it is submitted that it is well known in the art to provide only a portion of water to an oxyhydrogen generator in order to, for instance, control the concentration of desired chemicals in the water (see, for example, US Pat No 2,882,210 to Jenks).

Accordingly, it would have been readily obvious for the skilled artisan to modify either method of Wesley or Mehl such that the method includes providing only a portion of water to an oxyhydrogen generator in order to, for instance, control the concentration of desired chemicals in the water, as known in the art.

Per claim 33, it submitted that it is well known in the art to provide a pulsed electrical signal to electrodes in order to, for example, selectively degrade contaminants in wastewater (see, for example, US Pat No 4,140,609 to Zucker or US Pat No 5,549,812 to Witt a.k.a. Witte).

Accordingly, it would have been readily obvious for the skilled artisan to modify either method of Wesley or Mehl such that the method includes providing a pulsed electrical signal to electrodes in order to, for example, selectively degrade contaminants in wastewater, as known in the art.

10. Claims 29-30 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesley in view of Mehl (US Pat No 3,523,891).

Wesley is described above. Neither reference discloses converting a portion of the oxygen to ozone for disinfection or using the oxygen to fulfill oxygen demand.

Mehl discloses using electrolysis (10) to produce oxygen and hydrogen bubbles, the oxygen bubbles inherently leaving the water after they reach the water surface and being entrained in the gas drawn out by vacuum (30), and converting a portion of the oxygen to ozone (44) for disinfecting sewage and using the oxygen to fulfill oxygen demand (col. 2, lines 27-31).

It is submitted that it would have been readily obvious for the skilled artisan to modify the method of either Robert or Wesley by converting a portion of the oxygen to ozone for disinfecting sewage and using the oxygen to fulfill oxygen demand, as shown by Mehl.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References are cited of interest to show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Prince whose telephone number is (571) 272-1165. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30-4:00; alt. Fridays 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Fred Prince
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

fgp 8/19/05